



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Exploration and Discovery.

---

### AN IMPORTANT NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPT.

THE announcement is made that the great enterprise in New Testament textual criticism carried on under the direction of Professor von Soden, of Berlin, is approaching completion, and is soon to come to publication under the title *Die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes* (Berlin: A. Duncker). The first volume, containing prolegomena, is just about to be published, and the second, with the text of the New Testament "in its oldest attainable form," will appear within a year. The approaching publication of this new and important work makes it timely to call attention to a significant discovery made by one of Professor von Soden's assistants in the course of the preliminary researches, which has attracted less attention than it deserves.

In pursuing his aim of using for textual criticism the whole body of extant material, including all the minuscule (cursive) manuscripts, Professor von Soden sent a number of young scholars to the distant libraries, where these hitherto little-used sources of textual knowledge are to be found. The first fruit of these journeys was published in 1899 in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, under the title *Eine textkritische Arbeit des zehnten beziehungsweise sechsten Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben nach einem Kodex des Athosklosters Lawra*. It was by Licentiate Baron Eduard von der Goltz, now a Pommeranian pastor and already known in this country by his book, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Leipzig, 1894).

Mount Athos is a promontory, thirty miles long, inhabited wholly by monks of various nationalities, who form a semi-independent tributary republic under Turkish suzerainty. It is the seat of twenty large monasteries, and their libraries contain thousands of manuscripts, which are now receiving a great deal of attention from modern scholars. In this library Lic. von der Goltz has found a minuscule manuscript of the Acts, catholic epistles, and Pauline epistles, written probably in the tenth century, of a very remarkable character. It was prepared not for church use, but for the learned purposes of some biblical scholar who was interested in the problem of New Testament textual criticism. Von der Goltz thinks, on palæographical and other

grounds, that it may have had some connection with Arethas, archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, whose zeal for learning has preserved for the world most of the Christian apologies of the second century, as well as the "Thoughts" of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, besides giving us some of the best-known manuscripts of Euclid, Plato, and Dio Chrysostom. This interesting manuscript originally contained fifteen pages of introductory matter at the beginning, and the Apocalypse at the end. These have been removed, perhaps by the same hand which has cut away the subscription to Acts and erased many of the hundreds of scholia with which the manuscript was once furnished. Much has been left, however, and the character of the manuscript is revealed especially by the following note, which stands at the beginning of the Pauline epistles :

Be it known that the fourteen epistles of the apostle were written from a very ancient copy, which we have sufficient reason to believe was prepared (οὐ πείραν ἐλάβομεν ὡς ἐπιτετευγμένου) from the extant Tomoi or Homilies of Origen on the apostle; for we have found that it agrees with the text passages (ῥητοῖς) which he cites (μνημονεύει) in his interpretations either of the apostle or of other Scripture. At the texts, therefore, in which the man (ὁ ἀνὴρ) departs from (παρὰλλάττει) the now current apostolic readings, we have set the so-called διπλῇ [ > ] in the outer margin, in order that it may not be supposed that this copy of the apostle is wrong by way either of addition or of defect. But, having copied the epistle to the Romans from the Tomoi upon it which are preserved, we have not made use of the διπλῇ, and the epistle follows.

It appears from this note that the scribe of the manuscript had before him an exemplar of the Pauline epistles, the text of which was derived from Origen, and which, as we learn by another note, was written by a monk, Ephraim. A subscription to Ephesians, which a textual corruption (-ON for -ΘΗ) proves to be derived from the exemplar, shows that the text of that manuscript was *revised by* (ἀντανεγνώσθη) — not, as the introductory note might suggest, copied directly from — the Tomoi ("Books of Commentaries") of Origen. This connection with Origen the later scribe has tested by the use of the works of Origen now lost, but accessible in his day; and in the case of the epistle to the Romans he has deserted his exemplar and copied directly from the text-passages of the Tomoi. All this, which applies, of course, only to the Pauline epistles, as well as his notice about the διπλῇ, is fully substantiated by the manuscript itself. Throughout the Pauline epistles there are abundant scholia, relating to text and interpretation, drawn from Origen. For Romans, Galatians, and

Colossians, perhaps originally for other epistles, the beginning of the passage covered by each of Origen's Tomoi is noted, so that it is now possible to say just how much ground each of them covered. Differences between Origen's text-passage and the text presupposed by his comment are mentioned, likewise differences between the ancient copy written by Ephraim and the text of Origen. Account is taken of the smallest variants, such as the omission of an article or a personal pronoun. In addition mention is made of other "ancient copies." Throughout the Pauline epistles (except Romans) the διπλῆ is added to the passages according to the scribe's promise. He gives every evidence of great care and painstaking accuracy. That a large part of his learned material was derived from his predecessor, von der Goltz seems to have proved. Most important of all is the fact that his whole interest lay in preserving the divergences of his exemplar from the current text, not in silently conforming it to that late standard.

The situation in the Acts and catholic epistles is somewhat different, but not less interesting than in the Pauline epistles. Here the connection with Origen is less intimate, and the scribe's own notice about his work has been unhappily lost. Other church fathers are more abundantly quoted with Origen, especially Irenæus, Eusebius, and Clement. A partly legible scholion, however, of some length refers to "the copy written by the hand of the blessed Eusebius," and seems to contrast its reading on James 2:13 with that attested by the first book of the *Stromateis* of Origen. This is of the highest significance, because it brings the exemplar of our manuscript into some direct connection with the famous copies of Pamphilus and Eusebius and the great library at Cæsarea, and because not only the hexaplaric texts of the Greek Old Testament, but also a group of manuscripts of the New Testament, are more or less completely derived from that library. In one of the most important manuscripts of the Old Testament, the Codex Marchalianus, written in Egypt in the sixth century, a nearly contemporary hand has added copious hexaplaric notes, and a statement that the manuscript from which they are derived had been compared with the exegetical Tomoi of Origen. The fact of the comparison is attested by the present condition of the Marchalianus itself, which contains in the margin the numbers of Origen's Tomoi, exactly as does our manuscript at Mount Athos. In this it agrees with the kindred manuscript of the prophets, Codex Cryptoferratensis. Another Old Testament manuscript important for our purpose is no other than the Codex Sinaiticus, the third corrector of which (N<sup>e</sup>) declares that he has corrected in accord-

ance with the Codex corrected by the hand of Pamphilus, which was itself copied and corrected from the Hexapla of Origen. This third corrector of Codex  $\aleph$  worked in the New Testament as well as in the Old, and his readings there are akin to the text of Codex H<sup>paul</sup>, which has a colophon, doubtless taken from its exemplar, explaining that the text had been corrected by the manuscript written by Pamphilus. Moreover, certain minuscule codices have similar notes asserting some relation to the library at Cæsarea. It thus appears that this manuscript at Mount Athos is one of the most noteworthy of a class of New Testament manuscripts, the text of which goes back in greater or less measure to the Codex of Pamphilus at Cæsarea. It needs but to call to mind the fact that Origen was the Christian teacher whom Pamphilus most revered, that the latter sought industriously to collect his writings, that the Hexapla and Tetrapla themselves were preserved in the library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, and that Origen's text of the LXX drawn from them was published, according to Jerome, by Pamphilus and Eusebius, to see that the relation of this group to Origen as well as Pamphilus is only what ought to be expected. The determination of precisely what the work of Pamphilus was, and of the relation to it of the several existing manuscripts, is the task for which the discovery of this manuscript provides new means.

The suggestions given by these various facts have to be tested by the character and relationships of the text itself. The most elaborate study of the problem of such manuscripts so far published is that made by Professor Bousset, of Göttingen, whose *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament* (Leipzig, 1894) are the fruit of much conscientious labor, and in spite of some drawbacks are very important contributions to the subject. Bousset believed that for all the divisions of the New Testament he could point out groups of manuscripts, comprising a few uncials and many minuscules, which represent the Pamphilus text. Von der Goltz has carried this investigation somewhat farther with reference to his manuscript, and finds Bousset's results sustained. His study is, of course, preliminary in character, lacking, as it must, the aid which the publication of von Soden's materials and results will bring to all such work. The new manuscript, it appears, belongs to a class standing between the great uncials  $\aleph$  A B C D and the later uncials and minuscules. It has relations both with B and with the "Western" documents, and clearly belongs in the Acts and catholic epistles to Bousset's group  $\aleph^c$ . [4.] 13. 15. 18. 27. 29. 36. 40. [61] 66. 69. [98.] 105. 137. 180; in Paul to his group H.  $\aleph^c$ . 17. 23. 31. 37. 39. 47. 67\*\*.

71. 73. 80. 93. 115. 116. 118. 137. 179., to which are to be added M. 57. 109. 177. 178. Of these it should be noted that nine numbers of the two lists are different portions of the same codices. Especially 47<sup>paul</sup> is noteworthy, for in Rom., chaps. 1-14 (but not 15, 16), both its text and notes are somehow dependent on our manuscript. The Athos manuscript seems to preserve the text common to the group with greater completeness than any of the others.

The result, thus briefly indicated, of the provisional study of the textual character and relations of the new manuscript confirms and makes more definite the inferences from the notices of its origin which its scribe has left. It is probably not going too far when von der Goltz says (pp. 34 f.) :

The Codex Laura 184 goes back ultimately to a manuscript prepared at Cæsarea by Eusebius and Pamphilus, with the aid of the works of Origen ; it gives us this recension with a good degree of accuracy and without corrections to conform it to a later ecclesiastical text. New Testament criticism has now the definite task set it of reconstructing this Cæsarean recension. Especially if the attempt to define more closely the relation of B and  $\aleph^c$  to our group should succeed, there is every prospect that it will be possible, on the basis of so conscientiously written a manuscript as ours is, to restore with a high degree of probability the work of Eusebius and Pamphilus, and in very many cases to determine also with certainty the readings of Origen.

Bishop Westcott wrote in regard to this manuscript that it is a "most brilliant discovery," which "opens a new chapter in the history of the text to the New Testament." The importance seems to lie in three directions :

1. A considerable accession is made to our knowledge of the works of Origen and of the value of Rufinus's translations, for a large number of Greek fragments from Origen's lost works can be added from this manuscript.

2. An important step is taken toward opening up one path into the wilderness of the New Testament minuscules. At least three groups of these can already be studied to advantage: the Pamphilus group, in the investigation of which our manuscript gives essential aid ; the Euthalian group ; and the great group of the Syrian text, to which certainly too little serious attention has been devoted, and for the study of which the later uncials and especially the several purple gospels are important.

3. But the end to be gained in the reconstruction of the Codex of Pamphilus and of Origen's text is not only of negative importance, as

that of the Syrian recension might be, but of positive value. Our modern critical texts rest mainly on Codex B. Whether or not this is right can only be finally determined when the history and relations of the text of that great manuscript have been fully worked out. The problem is not solved until the evidence furnished by the Old Testament of B is understood and weighed. At present we have Cornill suggesting that the Old Testament in Codex B is only an extract from Origen's Hexapla made at Cæsarea, while Bousset holds that the New Testament portion gives only a "local Egyptian tradition" of the text owing its present form to a revision by Hesychius, and Burkitt and Lake take similar ground, while Dr. George Salmon, of Dublin, seems to stand not so far from such a view when he urges that the text of B and  $\aleph$  ought to be called, not "neutral," but "early Alexandrian," and implies that it is nothing but Origen over again. In the meantime a new and interesting contact between B and  $\aleph$  is pointed out by Dean Armitage Robinson, who demonstrated in his *Euthaliana* (Cambridge, England, 1895) that B and  $\aleph$  both owe their remarkable chapter divisions in Acts independently to the same Euthalian manuscript, which may have lain in the library at Cæsarea. On the other hand, Origen has long been observed to have many affinities with the "Western" text (if it be a "text"), and an exact determination of his relation to it must contribute much to the solution of the puzzling problem of its nature and value. The recent increase of interest in, and respect for, Codex Bezae and the Old Latin is but a symptom which shows how the results of the great makers of critical texts of the last thirty years have both stimulated students and left them unsatisfied; and from every side it appears that the question of Origen's text and its later fate lies at the center of these problems. It may well be that when the smoke of battle has cleared, Codex Vaticanus will be seen to be left in possession of the field; but more and more is made evident the truth of Westcott and Hort's principle: "All trustworthy restoration of corrupted texts is founded on the study of their history." For this study this lately discovered manuscript at Mount Athos furnishes such aid that it is not too much to call it one of the two most important discoveries for the criticism of the text of the New Testament made since Tischendorf acquired the Codex Sinaiticus.

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL,  
Cambridge, Mass.